

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPORT EXTENSION ACT OF 2001

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3189) to extend the Export Administration Act until April 20, 2002.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3189

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Export Extension Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

Section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419) is amended by striking "August 20, 2001" and inserting "April 20, 2002".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3189, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This is the extension of the Export Administration Act of 1979. It is H.R. 3189, and it is a measure approved by voice vote on October 31 by the Committee on International Relations. Enactment of this measure would reauthorize the existing Export Administration Act through April 20, 2002, thereby giving sufficient time for the House to act on comprehensive Federal Export Administration Act reform legislation considered on August 1, 2001.

The Export Administration Act was extended for 1 year in the 106th Congress, but that authority lapsed on August 20, and I would argue that we need to act on this measure today so we can keep this stopgap authority in place to maintain our export control authorities and to ensure that the Bureau of Export Administration has the enforcement powers it needs to stop terrorists from acquiring any dual-use goods or technologies that could be used to produce weapons of mass destruction.

The prompt enactment of this stopgap authorization will, moreover, enable the Bureau's administrators to protect licensing information and to increase the size of the fines for criminal and administrative sanctions against individuals and companies found to be in violation of our export control regulations.

A comprehensive reform measure, H.R. 2581, the Export Administration Act of 2001, considered by the Committee on International Relations on August 1, has now been referred to seven other House committees, and it is not expected to come before the House for further consideration until early next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will preserve the integrity of our Nation's export control system at a time when we can afford no less.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3189. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) has indicated the history here in terms of its expiration.

I personally believe that this time will also give us an opportunity to review the legislation. I think it is important for us to balance national security concerns with the impact that this has on American commerce and on our own national security posture.

While the President reestablished the general authority to control exports using his emergency economic powers, without a full EAA in force, the Department of Commerce lacks the full enforcement powers which may be necessary to safeguard United States national security. I think some Members were rather sanguine about this before September 11. I do think in the aftermath of September 11 and our coordinated effort and a global alliance against terrorism Members are concerned that we have the full range of support necessary to protect American interests.

But we do need to take advantage of this time to look at the underlying act. It needs to be brought up to date with current technologies in several ways. For instance, it is no secret that today people can routinely purchase off the shelf more computing power than was used to create the hydrogen bomb. We are all familiar with stories, not just apocryphal, where the technology in children's games, the Game Boys, commonly used by junior high students, could have been potentially subjected to this legislation in the past.

We also have to be very, very careful that we do not have unintended consequences by clamping down in an unrealistic fashion on American industry. We might well have the effect of diverting business to other countries

that do not enjoy the same range of protections that we have got, and it would not just be a case of hamstringing American industry, although I think all of us are concerned about the impact it may have on the technology-based industries that are the cornerstone of so many economies around the country and is part of our dominant position in the future.

It could have the effect of encouraging further business for foreign sources of competition that would leapfrog past us in terms of technology so we would lose our advantage, we would encourage other states, some that may not be friendly to the United States or others that might be a little looser in terms of how they sell the technology, so that at the end of the day, by being unrealistic and too bureaucratic in our structure of this act, we will have not just lost business for the United States companies but we will have seen this technology shift to other parts of the world so that we will actually be less safe.

But I do think that the extension that my colleague has talked about that is embodied in this legislation is a good window. We have had, with the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), other members of the committee, we have had productive discussions. We have laid the foundation to be able to do this properly in the future.

I hope we would be fair to American industry, be fair to American security interests, and move forward with the extension and come back in an expeditious fashion that will meet our needs now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3189.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EFFORTS OF PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES OF KOREAN ANCESTRY TO REUNITE WITH FAMILY MEMBERS IN NORTH KOREA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the efforts of people of the